

Applic. No.: 10/616,113
Amdt. Dated May 24, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 13, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-22 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 19 have been amended.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1-4, 7, and 19 have been rejected as being anticipated by Mosquera et al. (US 6,313,400) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In the penultimate paragraph on pages 3-4 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 6 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Mosquera et al. in view of Kaiserswerth et al. (US 3,885,084) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In the third paragraph on pages 4-5 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 8-18 and 20-22 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Mosquera et al. in view of McMiller et al. (US 6,194,653) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the

Applic. No.: 10/616,113
Amdt. Dated May 24, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 13, 2006

references. However, the language of claims 1 and 19 have been modified in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, inter alia:

at least first and second housing parts detachably connected to one another at a transition, said first and second housing parts each having end surfaces fitting with one another to spread electrical contact on a largest possible surface area therebetween, each of said end surfaces of said first and second housing parts having at least a first and a second corresponding bend in order to form an interlocked u-shaped profile, for providing additional protection against electrostatic and electromagnetic disturbances at the transition of said housing parts.

Claim 19 calls for, inter alia:

at least first and second housing parts detachably connected to one another at a transition, said first and second housing parts each having end surfaces fitting with one another to spread electrical contact on substantially all of a surface area therebetween said end surfaces, each of said end surfaces of said first and second housing parts having at least a first and a second corresponding bend in order to form an interlocked u-shaped profile, for providing additional protection against electrostatic and electromagnetic disturbances at the transition of said housing parts, said end surfaces being form-locking and having profiles with at least two sides at which electrically conductive contact occurs.

Mosquera et al. disclose sidewalls of a housing that is formed with dimples that each have a projection at one surface and a

Applic. No.: 10/616,113
Amdt. Dated May 24, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 13, 2006

recess at the other surface. The housing halves are assembled so that the sidewalls overlap with the dimples of the overlapping sidewalls locking to each other. Each dimple is formed by half-punching out an area of a sidewall so that the bottom of the dimple forms a downwardly facing surface for locking to the dimple of the other sidewall. As a result, the lower and upper surfaces of the dimples securely prevent separation of the assembled housing halves (see column 3, lines 53-55). In conclusion, the dimples do not provide additional protection against electrostatic and electromagnetic disturbances at the transition of the two housing parts.

It is a disadvantage of the device disclosed by Mosquera et al. that the self-punching out of the steel plate to produce the dimples could generate a gap in the material. It is a further disadvantage of the dimples disclosed by Mosquera et al. that they do not extend over the whole sidewall. Because of this, an electromagnetic influence could pass through the gap in the shielding. In Mosquera et al., no shielding effect is achieved since electromagnetic waves can pass between the dimples. The dimples only have a locking function.

In contrast, the invention of the instant application claims a "first and second corresponding bend" and not a dimple that is

Applic. No.: 10/616,113
Amdt. Dated May 24, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 13, 2006

made by a punching process. Furthermore, the invention of the instant application claims an interlocked u-shaped profile and not only locking dimples. The profile extends over the whole sidewall.

The references Kaiserswerth et al. and McMiller et al. have been discussed in the previous response and do not make up for the deficiencies of Mosquera et al.

In order to achieve an effective EMI shielding between a first and a second housing part where the first and the second housing part should be detachable, Mosquera et al. would lead to a housing where the first and the second parts are fitted together with dimples. This has the disadvantages concerning a lack of the shielding as discussed above.

To create a housing where the first and the second housing parts are detachably connected to one another and, moreover, to also create a protection against electrostatic and electromagnetic disturbances, additional steps would be necessary to arrive from an arrangement according to the teaching of Mosquera et al. to an arrangement as claimed in the invention of the instant application.

Applic. No.: 10/616,113
Amdt. Dated May 24, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 13, 2006

For example, a complete redesign of the connecting areas between the housing parts would be necessary. Lots of additional bends should be created to achieve an arrangement as claimed by the invention of the instant application. Mosquera et al. achieve the EMI protection by an overlapping of the housing parts and Mosquera et al. achieve a locking of the two housing parts by simples that each have a projection at one surface and a recess at the other surface. It is not disclosed by Mosquera et al. that a first and a second corresponding bend could achieve the object of providing two detachable housing parts for protecting against EMI by forming an interlocked u-shaped profile.

A further advantage of the invention of the instant application is that the housing parts are detachable in a very simple way and additionally that the EMI shielding is very effective because an electromagnetic wave is going to fizzle out in the "labyrinth" that is built by the u-shaped profile.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 and 19. Claims 1 and 19 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 19, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Applic. No.: 10/616,113
Amdt. Dated May 24, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 13, 2006

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-22 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,


For Applicants

Yonghong Chen
Reg. No. 56,150

YC

May 24, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101